

# Forestry, Wildlife, and Natural Resources

Forestry, Wildlife, and Natural Resources

## V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

### 1. Name of the Planned Program

Forestry, Wildlife, and Natural Resources

## V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

### 1. Program Knowledge Areas and

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources	30%	30%		
124	Urban Forestry	10%	10%		
125	Agroforestry	10%	10%		
134	Outdoor Recreation	25%	25%		
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife	15%	15%		
136	Conservation of Biological Diversity	10%	10%		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

## V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

### 1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	20.7	4.3	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	20.4	4.2	0.0	0.0

### 2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
<b>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</b> 424151	<b>1890 Extension</b> 248989	<b>Hatch</b> 0	<b>Evans-Allen</b> 0
<b>1862 Matching</b> 487294	<b>1890 Matching</b> 248989	<b>1862 Matching</b> 0	<b>1890 Matching</b> 0
<b>1862 All Other</b> 2824862	<b>1890 All Other</b> 438569	<b>1862 All Other</b> 0	<b>1890 All Other</b> 0

**V(D). Planned Program (Activity)****1. Brief description of the Activity**

The Forestry, Wildlife and Natural Resources Extension Team Project is a statewide program dedicated to developing citizen volunteer monitoring of Alabama's lakes, streams and coasts. Information is organized using the major watersheds of the state as a template. Involvement in the Alabama Water Watch Program (AWW) included promotion of AWW, serving as a resource center for water testing kits, coordination of workshops, and training as AWW monitors and trainers. New volunteers were provided with training through water chemistry, bacteriological, and stream biomonitoring workshops; existing volunteers were provided with recertification training. Experienced monitors were also provided additional training allowing them to become certified trainers. Water quality data collected by volunteers is available to the public on a list serve that is regularly updated. AWW participated in 18 outreach activities, 11 group meetings and events such as the Save Our Saugahatchee E. coli sampling blitz, and 13 miscellaneous meetings; attended and presented papers at 17 Conferences and Seminars. AWW publications and data were distributed to six states and other organizations; attended four AWW Association Meetings and several Clean Water Partnership and AWW group meetings. Approximately 60 people attended the AWW Annual Meeting and Picnic. Provision of natural resources education to the general public and educational programs targeting professional land managers was provided as a separate effort. These programs provided an overview of the wetland delineation process and related regulations, information on wetland and stream mitigation, and general information on water resources. Exploring Alabama's Living Streams curriculum workbook was printed; Citizen Volunteer Water Monitoring at Wolf Bay was published along with two newsletters and three brochures. Two editions of the Global Water Watch brochure was translated into Spanish and Portuguese, the AWW Association brochure was revised and printed and the AWW website was updated and maintained.

**2. Brief description of the target audience**

The Forestry, Wildlife and Natural Resources Extension Team Project is intended to provide information to the general population of Alabama and to provide educational material to professional land managers. The people who participated in activities related to this Project reflect a broad cross-section of the population. Sixty-five groups participated in AWW and submitted water quality data from nine of ten major watersheds. Eleven groups (17% of total) were formed by teachers and students, and five groups (8%) were formed mainly by professionals. The remaining 74% of groups were primarily composed of citizen volunteers. About nine percent of the groups sampled on the coast, while 19% sampled on lakes and 71% on streams across Alabama. Most AWW groups were located on the Tennessee Watershed followed closely by the Warrior, Tallapoosa, Coosa Watersheds. The most active groups were in the Coastal Plain (24% of data received), Tennessee (23% of data) and Tallapoosa (17% of data). Nine new monitoring groups were established. About 820 citizens held current AWW certifications during the report period. The professional land managers attending educational programs on wetland delineation and wetland and stream mitigation included loggers, land managers, master gardeners, employees of NGOs, and were predominantly male. General public attending natural resources education programs were predominantly youth (boy scouts, high school students) and a mix of roughly equal Caucasian and African-American.

**V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)****1. Standard output measures**

**Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods**

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	45000	162000	23000	83000
2007	6000	80000	300	10000

**2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)****Patent Applications Submitted**

**Year      Target**

**Plan:**    0

2007:    0

**Patents listed**

**3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)****Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	4	2	0

**V(F). State Defined Outputs****Output Target****Output #1****Output Measure**

- ? This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which are described/explained in the prior "outcome activities and methods sections." The success of many of these outcomes will be formally evaluated/measured by using individual activity evaluation forms designed specifically for each activity, the success of other activities and methods will be measured by the level of participation in the activity. In the target boxes below for each year, we are indicating the number of individual activities within the ETPs for this program area that will be formally evaluated using an evaluation instrument designed specifically for that activity.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	6	3

**Output #2****Output Measure**

- ? 87 training sessions, 420 people certified, 28 water chemistry workshops involving 262 people, 30 recertification sessions involving 110 people, 13 bacteriological workshops involving 132 people, 2 stream biomonitoring workshops involving 34 people, 10 new trainers certified during 4 Training-of-Trainer workshops, 65 citizen groups submitted data from 9 of 10 major watersheds, approximately 800 people subscribe to AWW listserve where 80% of data collected was entered; 60 professionals participated in continuing education workshops focused on wetland delineation and stream and wetland mitigation. Approximately 125 youth participated in hands-on natural resource education programs that included field exercises, introduction to natural resource on-line resources, and conventional classroom delivery of material.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**V(G). State Defined Outcomes**

O No.	Outcome Name
1	A major outcome will be the increase in active, viable county forestry and wildlife committees.
2	Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

## **Outcome #1**

### **1. Outcome**

A major outcome will be the increase in active, viable county forestry and wildlife committees.

### **2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

### **3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

### **3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	30	0

### **3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement**

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

### **4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources
136	Conservation of Biological Diversity
124	Urban Forestry

## **Outcome #2**

### **1. Outcome**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

### **2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	6	0

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

#### Issue (Who cares and Why)

Alabama is experiencing growth in population and a shift from rural to urban-based population. This puts increasing pressure on natural resources, especially water. Water quality and quantity are two issues that are of great importance to everyone in the state.

#### What has been done

Development of programs to educate the general public about water quality and related resources. Training of the general public in water monitoring techniques which empowers people to watch over their water resources.

#### Results

Wolf Bay Watershed has been monitored by AWW volunteers for 10 years and this has led to it being upgraded to 'Outstanding Alabama Water' classification. One volunteer was able to resolve a leaking sewer line in a matter of weeks through bacteria monitoring. Alabama Water Watch has received a grant for phase 1 implementation of a nine-year plan to clean up a polluted creek in the Auburn/Opelika metropolitan area, and a The Third Annual State of Our Watershed Conference—The Tallapoosa River Basing was held in April and was attended by about 70 people including business representatives, environmental citizen groups, post-secondary education-research personnel, and representatives from municipal, state and federal agencies, real estate and public schools. Professionals who attended educational programs ranked them as very useful and indicated an interest in related programs in the future.

### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife
134	Outdoor Recreation

### V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

#### External factors which affected outcomes

- ? Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- ? Appropriations changes
- ? Government Regulations
- ? Competing Public priorities
- ? Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

#### Brief Explanation

The widespread drought conditions that existed in most of the state, and the southeast in general, increased the interest in water-related issues. This created an environment in which people who might not have been interested suddenly found that water was an important issue for them.

### V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

#### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- ? Before-After (before and after program)
- ? During (during program)
- ? Comparisons between program participants (individuals, group, organizations) and non-participants

### **Evaluation Results**

In general, programs from this Extension Team Project have been well-received and the information generated by the participants of the AWW program are widely sought after as illustrated by the significant use of the list serve and requests for this information made by other states and agencies. Participants in the programs targeting professional land managers rated the programs as above-average and requested additional programming in related areas for the next year.

### **Key Items of Evaluation**

87 training sessions, 420 people certified, 28 water chemistry workshops involving 262 people, 30 recertification sessions involving 110 people, 13 bacteriological workshops involving 132 people, 2 stream biomonitoring workshops involving 34 people, 10 new trainers certified during 4 Training-of-Trainer workshops, 65 citizen groups submitted data from 9 of 10 major watersheds, approximately 800 people subscribe to AWW listserve where 80% of data collected was entered; 60 professionals participated in continuing education workshops focused on wetland delineation and stream and wetland mitigation. Approximately 125 youth participated in hands-on natural resource education programs that included field exercises, introduction to natural resource on-line resources, and conventional classroom delivery of material.